



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/814,563	03/22/2001	Leo Parker	2378/104	4515

2101 7590 04/20/2005  
BROMBERG & SUNSTEIN LLP  
125 SUMMER STREET  
BOSTON, MA 02110-1618

EXAMINER

GREENE, DANIEL L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3621

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/814,563

**Applicant(s)**

PARKER ET AL.

**Examiner**

Daniel L. Greene

**Art Unit**

3621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 March 2005.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments filed 3/31/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive..

The Applicant has addressed each Prior Art as if it stood alone Apparently disregarding the 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) type of rejection. One cannot show non-obviousness by attacking the references individually where the rejection is based on a combination of references. *In re Young*, 159 USPQ 725 (CCPA 1968). All three of the Prior Art specified and used are in the field of accessing databases and in particular Conmy and Schuster specifically disclose scheduling of different parties to participate in a common event.

The Applicant has Amended to emphasize that the specific limitation of "... to an indication of whether an attendee has granted the user permission to view the attendee's availability data." The Examiner has addressed the issue of an indication of whether an attendee granted permission to access the calendar data on pages 4 and 5 of the previous Office Action. However, the Examiner reviewed the Specifications for a clarification of the term "an indication". The Specification does not appear to provide insight into the term "an indication" via a definition or phrase. Because there does not appear to be a clarification or definition of the term "an Indication", the Examiner interprets the phrase to be one that a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to mean. This meaning is detailed on pages 4 and 5 of the last action.

Claims 1-28 are pending with claims 29 and 30 newly added.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. **Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Conmy et al. U.S. Patent 6,101,480 [Conmy], Schuster et al. U.S. Patent 6,577,622 B1 [Schuster], and further in view of Rubert et al. U.S. Patent 6,366,915 [Rubert].**

As per claims 1, 14, 22, and 28:

Conmy discloses the claimed invention except for the primary user using a wireless scheduling device. However, Conmy does disclose the concept of mobile and disconnected users being provided the same C&S (calendar and scheduling) functionality that is available to them when they are connected to the LAN. Col. 11, lines 3-15. Schuster teaches that it is known in the art to provide a PID (Protocol identifier) interface such as a PDA (Personal Digital Assistant). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the C&S system of Conmy with the PID interface of Schuster, in order to permit the user to be mobile and use his PDA for scheduling meetings and being kept up to date on the meetings he is scheduled to attend.

The examiner recognizes that references cannot be arbitrarily combined and that there must be some reason why one skilled in the art would be motivated to make the proposed combination of primary and secondary references. In re Nomiya, 184 USPQ 607 (CCPA 1975). However, there is no requirement that a motivation to make the modification be expressly articulated. The test for combining references is what the combination of disclosures taken, as a whole would suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art. In re Simon, 174 USPQ 114 (CCPA 1972); In re McLaughlin, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). References are evaluated by what they suggest to one versed in the art, rather than by their specific disclosures. In re Bozek, 163 USPQ 545 (CCPA 1969). Schuster is a system that is scheduling and bringing together participants in a conference call/meeting. Both Conmy and Schuster deal with bringing participants together at a common time and place. Conmy's place is physical while Schuster's place is primarily electronic. The end results are both effectively the same. That is a multiple participant having the ability to communicate and interact with each other within the same time period.

communicating an availability request from a user to a server to view availability data set for the set of attendees using the scheduling device, the server having access to the calendar data for each attendee in the set of attendees; Conmy, Col. 4, lines 12-40.

Conmy discloses the claimed invention except for the use of a wireless device. However, Conmy does teach about utilizing wireless devices as detailed in the previous section. Schuster teaches that it is known in the art to use a wireless device for C&S. It

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the C&S system of Conmy with the wireless capabilities of Schuster in order to provide the user with greater flexibility in the use of their time.

As per the previous section on the **Claim Amendment**, the limitation of the use of a wireless network facility is addressed and does not render the claim patentable.

Conmy and Schuster disclose the claimed invention except for an indication of whether an attendee has granted the user permission to view the attendee's availability data, and receiving by the scheduling device from the server the availability data set only for those attendees who have granted permission to view the attendee's availability data. However, Conmy does teach about a listing portion providing a list of invitees sorted by those for whom calendar information cannot be found. Col. 8, lines 8-20. The Examiner submits that one reason an invitee could not be found is that the user did not have permission to access their database. Conmy further teaches about the use of different status indicators in reference to the invitees such as "Free Time," "Busy Time," "OK," "Conflict," or "Other". A reference is to be considered not only for what it expressly states, but also for what it would reasonably have suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art. *In re DeLisle*, 160 USPQ 806 (CCPA 1969). Conmy reasonably suggest the use of status indicators to provide the user with information that they think is important to know about the invitee. Conmy does not specifically disclose an indication of whether an attendee granted permission to view the attendee's availability data.

However these differences are only found in the nonfunctional descriptive material and are not functionally involved in the steps recited. The status indicator

Art Unit: 3621

steps would be performed the same regardless of the type of data. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, *see In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to set up status indicators that were important to the user, i.e. Free Time, Busy Time Conflict, Permission to Access Denied, because such identification of data does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of the data does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

In reference to Conmy and Schubert not specifically teaching receiving by the scheduling device from the server the availability data set only for those attendees who have granted permission to view the attendee's availability data.

Rubert teaches that it is known in the art to provide receiving by the scheduling device from the server the availability data set only for those attendees who have granted permission to view the attendee's availability data. Col. 12, lines 8-20. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the status indicators of Conmy with the receiving by the scheduling device from the server the availability data set only for those attendees who have granted permission to view the attendee's availability data of Rubert, in order to provide the user with a list of viable attendees by not including the attendees who did not allow the server to access their data.

As per claims 2, 15, and 23:

Conmy and Schuster further disclose:

displaying data derived from the availability data set on the wireless scheduling device. Conmy, Fig. 5-9.

As per claims 3, 16, and 24:

Conmy further disclose:

wherein the data derived from the availability data set is displayed as free time and busy time. Fig. 5-9.

As per claims 4 and 17:

Conmy further disclose:

wherein the availability request is communicated to the server via a network. Col. 4, lines 14-30.

As per claims 5 and 18:

Conmy further disclose:

wherein the network includes the Internet. Col. 4, lines 14-30.



As per claims 6, 19, and 25:

Conmy further disclose:

wherein the availability request includes an identifier for each attendee and a time period for which availability should be determined. Col. 3, lines 50-55, lines 55-64.

As per claims 7, 20, and 26:

Conmy further disclose:

wherein the identifier for each attendee is an email address. Col. 3, lines 50-55.

As per claims 8 and 21:

Conmy further disclose:

wherein the calendar data for each attendee is stored in an availability database in communication with the server. Col. 4, lines 1-10.

As per claim 9:

Conmy further disclose:

scheduling an event based on the availability data set. Fig. 3-4.

As per claim 10:

Conmy discloses the claimed invention except for the wherein the event is scheduled using the wireless scheduling device. . Schuster teaches that it is known in the art to provide wherein the event is scheduled using the wireless scheduling device.

Art Unit: 3621

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the C&S system of Conmy with the wherein the event is scheduled using the wireless scheduling device of Schuster, in order to provide the user with greater flexibility and availability.

As per claim 11:

Conmy further disclose:

updating the availability data for each attendee with the scheduled event. Col. 5, lines 52-62.

As per claim 12:

Conmy further disclose:

requesting permission to view availability data for each attendee in the set of attendees. Col. 5, lines 35-51.

As per claim 13:

Conmy further disclose:

wherein access to availability data is requested via email over the Internet. Col. 9, lines 10-15.

As per claim 27:

Conmy does not expressly show wherein the permission to view the availability data of the attendee is stored in an availability database in communication with the server. However, Conmy does show a database **200**, which contains USER PROFILES **202**. Fig. 1, Col. 3, lines 45-55. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time to which the invention pertains would have known to include in the user profile whether or not the attendee would provide permission to access their data.

Also, the type of data is nonfunctional descriptive material and is not functionally involved in the steps recited. The scheduling steps would be performed the same regardless of the name of the data. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to collect from a customer any type of data that was relevant because such data does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of the data does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

As per claim 29:

Conmy discloses the claimed invention except for communicating a second availability request, wherein the second availability request is a request from the attendee to access the availability data of the user.. However, Conway does disclose communicating an availability request from a user to a server to view availability data set for the set of attendees using the scheduling device, the server having access to the calendar data for each attendee in the set of attendees; Conmy, Col. 4, lines 12-40.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to communicating a second availability request, wherein the second availability request is a request from the attendee to access the availability data of the user, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8.

As per claim 30:

Conmy does not expressly show wherein the attendee has granted the user permission to view the attendee's availability data only during a specified period of time. However, Conmy does show a database **200**, which contains USER PROFILES **202**. Fig. 1, Col. 3, lines 45-55. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time to which the invention pertains would have known to include in the user profile whether or not the attendee would provide permission to access their data.

Art Unit: 3621

Conmy discloses the claimed invention, as discussed above, except for the step of wherein the attendee has granted the user permission to view the attendee's availability data only during a specified period of time. It would have been an obvious matter to modify the teachings of Conmy, to provide the step of wherein the attendee has granted the user permission to view the attendee's availability data only during a specified period of time. Since the applicant has not disclosed that wherein the attendee has granted the user permission to view the attendee's availability data only during a specified period of time solves any stated problem in a new or unexpected way or is for any particular purpose which is unobvious to one of ordinary skill and it appears that the claimed feature does not distinguish the invention over similar features in the prior art since, the teachings of Conmy will perform the invention as claimed by the applicant with any means, method, or product to wherein the attendee has granted the user permission to view the attendee's availability data only during a specified period of time

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims below for the convenience of the applicant.

Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

***Conclusion***

2. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel L. Greene whose telephone number is 703-306-5539. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Thur. 8am-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James P. Trammell can be reached on 703-305-9768. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



JAMES P. TRAMMELL  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

Daniel L. Greene  
Examiner  
Art Unit 3621

4/5/2005